

at all. They disavow any such elevated motive, any such disinterested consideration, but boast to have taken under their special care the rights of the whites to the exclusive pursuit of free labor in the Territories. Made bare and free with such intense selfishness, trained, exercised, oiled and disciplined in such indecent nakedness of all moral considerations, even in the most intensely moral conflict ever forced into politics, these beings constitute fit political jockeys, but nothing better, nothing else. A conscience towards God is essential in the conflict against slavery, and not an intention of expediency merely, or a conscience towards the majority. If the party professedly for freedom would take conscience for their guide, and the people could once feel that they are honest and determined in the right, they would get the victory. But that party which, with correct principles, is afraid to follow them, afraid even to acknowledge them, afraid of the very men who would be faithful to them, as not being candidates available for success, and of all things afraid of being too much in the right, will be crushed, despised, ridden over roughshod, by any party, with principles however wicked, not afraid of their principles, and determined to carry them out.

When the time comes for carrying principle into action against slavery, so far as to do anything, or propose anything, or mean anything for the deliverance of the enslaved, were party politicians send and dire like frightened seals or beavers. They deny any principle that looks that way. There is no anti-slavery in them, nor would there be the slightest hope of mercy for the slave in the success of such a party, nor could any conscientious Christian give to such a party a solitary vote. And if such a party obtain the votes of any honest men, it will be in spite of such elaborate professions of depravity, and because the party are believed to be better than those men in it who, in the hope of votes in certain quarters, proclaim such detestable abnegation of principle, and yet, for the sake of votes, would be glad in some other quarters to be thought anti-slavery. The bogus profession of anti-slavery, along with the pledge never to interfere with slavery where it exists, reminds us of the honest played upon a pious old negro, the burden of whose constant prayer used to be that God would send good angels, and take Caesar's soul to heaven. One night, just before retiring, he was startled by a knock at his cabin door. Who's dar? he called out. 'The Lord's messenger,' was the response, in a deep sepulchral tone: 'time for Caesar to die.' What do the Lord's messenger want? he tremblingly asked. 'Want' Caesar's soul,' broke on the solemn stillness. Out went the light, and under the bed went the humble, pious petitioner, exclaiming, 'No such nigger here, sah! been dead two weeks!' Just so with the professions of anti-slavery principle in some of our politicians, and anti-slavery piety in some of our ministers and Churches. When the demand comes to put the principle into action against slavery, the light is put under a bed. No such principle in our party; been dead ever since the last election. We pledge ourselves not to interfere with slavery where it exists. We purge ourselves of all suspicion of opposing slavery as to the negro race, all taint of Abolitionism. We go for the superiority of free labor over slave labor in the Territories, meaning that we are determined that none but whites shall have any opportunity at free labor at all.

There are those who sincerely believe that the success of such a party would be more disastrous, more hopeless for the enslaved, than even that of the party that declare the rightfulness and justice of slavery over the whole country. There is no ground on which we can meet the slave party but the ground of conscience, truth and righteousness. If property in man anywhere is not a crime, then everywhere it has the same right as any other property. The slaveholder, with his slaves, has just as good a right and title to the Territories as you have to them without slaves, and has just as perfect a right to carry his slaves all over the Union, and have them protected as his property, as you have to carry your children, your farming utensils, your books, your presses, your schools. But if free labor is right, if you have the right, as free laborers, to exclude slavery from the Territories, or to prevent its extension, it is only because free labor is just; and slavery being wrong, you are bound by God and justice to oppose slavery everywhere. You can oppose it with the Constitution only on the ground of its being wrong, only on the ground of the same right of the blacks to freedom as your own; for if slave property be not wrong, it belongs everywhere, wherever men choose to carry it. If it is wrong, your first duty and business is to break it up where it is already established. If it is right, it is right everywhere; and if you admit it anywhere, as right, you must admit it everywhere.

When the moral assassination of the colored race was committed by the Dred Scott decision, and the after-stab of Judges made it sure, I asked, 'What will you do with the body of your victim? You are at your wit's end to know what to do. Not so at the South; they see and feel, with a terrible certainty, that all must be slaves, in order to keep down those that are thus murdered, from insurrection in their living graves. When Washington said, Put none but Americans on guard to-night, it was a crisis for freedom. It is now a crisis for slavery, and the watchword is, None but slaves, or we perish. In this moral assassination, kill all, or we are betrayed. And the poor whites themselves join in this slaveholding slogan. And the poorer, baser, meaner whites of the North, camp-followers, expectant kettles-bearers of the slaveholding Democracy, merchant princes on their knees before this Dagon, waiters on a dry-goods' providence, with still deeper malignancy curse the negro race, and, like a pack of baying, panting hounds, would drive them from existence. The policy foreshadowed in some quarters in regard to these matters, both North and South, is so selfish, so cruel, so atrocious, that the impending crime becomes terrible. It is proposed to abolish, not slavery, but the slaves, the whole race, to cast them forth out of the country, as a nuisance and a curse.

On one occasion, many years ago, I remember, when the British Empire was in a ferment in regard to the Irish, and their asserted wrongs, and the question was asked in Parliament, What shall we do with Ireland? a member replied, 'Scuttle her.' This is the amount of the cool, hardened cruelty proposed in regard to the colored race of the United States. Slough them off! Expatriate them! Scuttle them! Keep the slaves where they are, and guarantee the vested rights of the slave States in them as property, and at the same time expatriate all the free negroes, and keep both slave and free out of the Territories. Leave slavery where it is, and keep it where it is, sending back all fugitives, and maintaining it by law as a domestic institution. Shut it up in the slave States, and it will die out; but promise not to interfere with it there, directly or indirectly. In these promises and propositions, the most distant idea of any right to freedom on the part of the enslaved, or any obligations of justice or mercy on our part towards them, or any assertion of their rights, or even of the right of any attempt on our part to redeem and deliver them, is as completely ignored, and in effect denied and forbidden, as if they were exiles in Siberia. The barbarous inhumanity of these propositions, towards whites as well as blacks, if slavery be considered a wrong and an evil, can hardly be described or appreciated. Suppose that a deadly pestilence were raging in some part of our country, and, instead of sending physicians, medicines, nurses, suppose we should dig a mud round the whole region, and, forbidding the escape of any fugitive, should leave the victims of the pestilence to die, and the land to be depopulated. Suppose that a fire were raging in a great city, and, there being a powerful manufactory within its limits, suppose that the proprietors of the outlying farms and villages should cut off all communication, and stand

afar off, and see the city burn, meantime driving back within its walls all that endeavored to escape from it. Suppose that the country should denounce all other action excepting only this as unconstitutional. Suppose that the country should, in the name of God and the Constitution, solemnly pledge themselves not to interfere in any way, directly or indirectly, with the pestilence and the conflagration, where they were raging; but, on the other hand, to guarantee the security and perpetuity of the evil as a vested right not to be meddled with!

If such be the policy to be proclaimed and pursued in regard to the crime and pestilence of slavery, it is diabolical, and the more so because the pretence is that by such a policy, you ensure the termination of the evil. But in what way? Is this a Christian remedy? Is this the command of mercy that comes to you from the word of God, or of justice from the majesty of Heaven? The evil you say will die out, if you can only secure the country against its extension. The evil will die out, if you only prevent any more slave States from being established. Restraint, therefore, your policy of reform, your Christianity, your benevolence, to that, and leave the sin alone, where it is now rioting in the morals and miseries of millions beneath its despotism. And this is the remedy proposed by Christian men and brethren, commanded to love their neighbors as themselves! This is the proposition of Christian reformers, to let slavery die out among its rotting, dying, imploring victims! To let it die out, by letting it work on, in all its atrocity and cruelty, as a guaranteed, constitutional *gemma*, marked off, moated off, environed, amidst surrounding spectators and powers of mercy and of justice, that might scatter the fuel of its perdition, and rescue its millions of burning men, women and children, as brands from the burning, by the legitimate power of the gospel of God and the Constitution! This *gemma* you might have changed into a school of freedom and piety, but you refused to interfere, and consented to its sanction and continuance, and guaranteed its permanence, as a vested interest, a missionary institution, a domestic bell, which the owning and superintending demons have a perfect right to perpetuate for their own profit and power!

There is no language that can suitably describe and denounce such monstrosities. The worship of God and Baal together was no worse among the Jews than the embrace and amalgamation of such doctrines. What a hideous, morbid, debased thing must freedom be, which is the compound of such selfishness and cruelty! The temple of God, under Solomon's wildest madness of compound concubines and idolatry, even when altars and incense arose to Moloch and Jehovah side by side, was not so signally disgraced by such abominations as our religion and theology by such avowed and practiced impieties. We talk about infidelity, and the horribleness of laws justifying it, or of a united public opinion, legal sanction and moral justification making that practice one of the vested rights of human beings in society. But what is that in comparison with the pretence of a vested right, morally justified, to brand the babes of five millions, as soon as they are born, as chattels, that is to steal them from their birth, assassinate their personality, and make merchandise of them from the cradle to the grave! If God has set murder as a crime to be punished with death, and if, on that account, infanticide being the crime of murder, is to be judged with the same abhorrence, and punished in the same way, then, by the same rule, since man-stealing is also set down of God as a crime, of the same kind as murder, and to be punished in like manner, it follows that babe-stealing, the converting of babes into chattels, the making merchandise of them, is also and equally a crime worthy of death. And yet we have the spectacle of professedly Christian men of all parties uniting in the justification and defence of this crime, declaring that the right to commit it is an inherent right of State sovereignty, and a vested right of slave property, and exulting each other in the proclamation of a pledge never to interfere with that right! A spectacle so debasing, so vile a degradation of manhood and Christianity, never seen on earth. The crime of the Sodomites in attacking angels was not to be compared with the wickedness of turning innocent babies into things to be used from the cradle to the grave for the lust and avarice of their owners.

Now, to think of such tenets as these being instilled into the heart of the community, by the preachers, political and ecclesiastical, of such a slaveholding theology and liberty! They weave the spider's web, and hatch cockatrice's eggs; but that catch of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper. It may be said of this progressive pestilence, this infant corruption of morals, gangrening not only the heart and mind of the people, but striking the very Constitution with sickness and death, it may be said, as of Job's leprosy, By the great force of my disease is my very garment changed, and bindeth me about, as the collar of my coat. The habit of such corruption of conscience and heart, if not resisted, if not thrown off, becomes not only a national war-rascal, but even as in nature the bark of one year's growth becomes the wood of the next, so it turns inward, and becomes at once vitalized and hardened as an unchangeable life. Thus we are going on. Our laws, our theology, our mercantile and social existence, under the spread of this iniquity, the power of these pestilential teachings, are becoming like a tangled wilderness of scrub Upar trees, infested with deadly serpents. At every step you breathe poison, your flesh is torn by the knotted, thorny underbrush, and your veins, your blood, take up the virus. It is a region of horrors, in which the liards and snakes of a preadamic world, not intended for man's abode, crawl over you and glare upon you.

It is the breathing of such an air, the getting accustomed to such moral monstrosities, the diseased condition of the moral sense consequent upon them, the stupefaction, the oppression, as of a moral poison in the soul, that has prepared the people to endure, unmoved, such outrages as would have stung their fathers to madness, and to look stupidly on, while right after right is being invaded and taken from us, and usurpation after usurpation is set as precedent and law. Our free citizens are thrown into jail at the uplifted finger of the Slave Power, without so much even as the allegation of a crime. Where is our Personal Liberty bill, needed not for fugitive slaves only, but for all men who have not a fugitive and lying conscience, ready to forsake God and humanity at the beck of the oppressor? It is the least and lowest thing that any sovereign State can do for its citizens, to protect them in the rights of personal liberty, to defend them at least from being seized by a foreign power on their own soil, torn from their families and thrust into jail, without crime, and without even the pretence of trial. If a sovereign State cannot protect its citizens against such tyranny, such violence, what is its sovereignty worth—what is its good for? If any sovereign State will let its citizens be snatched up in this insolent way, refusing even the writ that should take them from the grasp of such tyranny, and bring them to a fair trial, we see not what prerogative of sovereignty it has left which is not a mere sham. John Randolph's toast concerning State Rights may be drank by the slaveholders over the dead body of such a sovereignty with a hip and hurrah! *De mortuis, nil nisi bonum*. And the Slave Power can afford to give to such a State, that will thus sacrifice the personal liberty of its citizens, at the bidding of an infamous unconstitutional federal slave bill, or Senatorial Investigating Committee, the largest privilege of blinding and flogging against slavery. Such a State may be indulged by the Federal Government, and the Slave Power enthroned over it, in any, the most extravagant jubilation and enthusiasm, concerning the opening of the prison-doors and letting the oppressed go free, in any freaks and sallies of

speculative demonstrations, in conventions, in resolutions, in speeches all blazoning with the pyrotechnics and thundering with the detonating powder of the highest Republican or Democratic liberty. The grander such harmless, ineffective enthusiasm, the safer for the slave tyranny; the more sublime the flight of the spread-eagle of popular eloquence, the more abject and spiritless will such a people be, whose order in the cause of freedom shuns the form and cost of brave, decisive deeds, and expends itself in speculative boasts and hallooings. There being no intention, nor any danger, of going beyond the form of speculation concerning liberty, it costs nothing, as Burke said of the flights of hypocrisy, to have them magnificent. And our slave-drivers need not be afraid, though Bunker Hill Monument itself should, one of these Fourth of Julys, be rammed full with powder, and the charge wadded with all the glittering generalities of the Declaration of Independence, and the column slanted and fired down South, with the huge, hissing, red-hot ball flaming from its granite throat, that all men are born free and equal, black or white, and that property in man is a lie, a curse, an impossibility.

Our liberties are going down to the pit, and we with them, by submission to such invasions, and the breathing of such pestilential winds of doctrine that accompany them, as fast as any remorseless and successful despotism could ever carry us. There lies at this very moment in Washington jail, for conscience' sake, and for the assertion of our rights, our liberties, a free citizen, our friend and brother—a very Hampden in his position, and as noble and sincere in his soul—a finely-toned, enthusiastic, noble spirit—our friend and brother Hyatt; and it is conscience and the rights of conscience—yours, mine, that are outraged in his imprisonment. Law, truth, conscience, justice, equity, freedom, piety, everything dear to us, is outraged in this act. Mr. Hyatt treated the Senate with marked defiance and respect. He presented himself freely before them. He did not refuse to answer any of their questions that might be put to him in courtesy, and not thrust upon him under the uplifted lash of the slave-driver. He merely denied, as in his conscience he was bound to deny, that they had any right to compel him to answer. And for that declaration, as for crime, this insolent body of the people's servants instantly, as though they were a court of justice sitting on trial, and armed with that indefinite and awful power of accusation and punishment of what is called contempt of court, threw these free citizens into prison. Why, my friends, if the man had committed a crime, it would have shamed him! They could not have dealt with him thus, could not have touched him with the finger of their despotism; but being innocent, and declaring himself governed by a conscience towards God, being accused of no crime, and guilty of none, so as not to come within the jurisdiction of any law, they can treat him, driven by their own despotic rage at his claim of conscience, as they could not treat even a felon. If he had been accused of some definite and horrible crime—if he had really committed it, before and against that body—if he had drawn a revolver, and shot Senator Mason through the heart—then they could not have condemned him nor punished him without trial; could not even have arrested him without warrant; could not have moved one step against him without indictment, court, judge, jury, counsel, witnesses, all. But he having, without any crime, declared to the Senate that in his conscience he did not think or believe that an investigating committee of the Senate had lawful power to compel him to answer their questions, for that declaration, as for crime, they can hurry him away to prison on the instant, overriding, crushing, annihilating accusation, indictment, trial, court, judge, jury and witnesses, all in one motion, all at one blow. Now, consider what an enormity is this. What an awful, irresponsible power is here claimed and exercised, by which, at any time, through subtle management in the Senate, raising a committee with powers, a faction in that body may seize any man obnoxious to it, any man, anywhere, who stands in the way of its will, its tyranny, and put him out of the way, without the uncertain, slow and dangerous operation even of false accusation of crime, which indeed could not bring him before them. But any pretence of being engaged in any investigation for the people can, according to his assumed power; and his liberty is taken from him without trial, and without any power in the people to restore it to him! If this can be done, if this can be endured, we are the most pitifully power-ridden and hypocritical pretenders to freedom that ever breathed.

If the Investigating Committee of the Senate had been sitting as a Court, even of legislation, there might have been some little shadow of authority; because, in a Judicial Court, the body are presumed to possess, and by custom do possess, this despotic power to throw a man instantly into prison for contempt of Court, a power so liable to be abused, (as in the case of Passmore Williamson), that it ought not to be permitted without a trial by jury, as for every other crime. But the Committee of the Senate is no such Judicial Committee, no such Court. A Committee cannot clothe itself with the powers of a Court, nor be so invested. The Senate cannot create any such Court, nor transform itself into any such Court. But even if it could, this Committee were no such Court, but a mere political court, an instrument raised for a purely political object, no necessity for it, no interests of the nation demanding it, no new legislation requisite, or contemplated by it, nothing under heaven in view but the protection of slave property and the increase of the Slave Power. The assumption, therefore, of the powers and sacredness of a Court of Justice, for the sake of punishing Mr. Hyatt, was a contempt of the whole people; and the exercise of any such power is a daring usurpation beyond law, and against law. It would have graced the annals of Caligula, and Tacitus would have recorded its endurance by the people as one of the evidences how irreversibly they had lost the spirit of freedom, and yielded themselves, in utter degradation, to the tyrant's will. This usurpation is the most barefaced iniquity yet committed by any branch of our government. Even a Judicial Court could not exercise this tremendous power of imprisonment for contempt without trial, except in pursuance of their legitimate vocation. If Judge Taney and his associates should form themselves into an Investigating Committee, to look into the causes and consequences of the bolting or splitting in the Charleston Convention, and should summon witnesses, does any man in his senses imagine that they would have the power of throwing a Democrat into prison for contempt of Court in not answering? or in asserting a right of conscience? or for affirming, on his conscience, that they had no authority given them by law to play the inquisitor over him?

The temper and daring that are capable of this outrage against Mr. Hyatt, when it is found that such an outrage can be endured, and therefore can be safely committed, will do anything, will shrink from nothing, in the service of the Slave Power. And a people willing to endure this, to let it pass into precedent, custom, opinion and law, no raising of the masses against it, no movement of conscience at God's command, no indignation of the heart to put it down, no assertion of right and justice, of truth and freedom against it, are prepared for any outrage upon their own rights, for any surrender of their own liberties. The Senate may take the whole government into their hands, may change the very forms and processes of government, from a government of law to a government by inquisitorial Committees, Star Chambers, investigating screws, leashes of bloodhounds, infuriated with madness by the scent of John Brown's martyrdom, fierce and strong enough to leap from Washington to Concord, but not capable, even after such a spring, of standing before the face of an heroic woman, and baffled by the steady courage of

the descendants of those yomen who once drove back a whole regiment of military invaders, halting, panting, disabled, discouraged, half-dead, whom, however, as British soldiers, it were a disgrace to compare with the American freedom fighters. I say, the Senate may do all this, and may throw a free citizen of Massachusetts, by the mere dictum of a Committee, into prison, though accused of no crime, permitted no trial, nor form of accusation, nor indictment, nor opportunity to answer for himself, nor investigation of the case, nor Court, nor Judge, nor Jury, nor Law, by a bold, insolent exercise of irresponsible, lawless, unauthorized power, by a sheer daring usurpation of powers belonging only to the whole government, and possible to be exercised by the government only according to definite law; by the concentration of such power within their own body, through the base form of a Committee of Investigation, the Senate may take away the liberty of a free citizen, may throw him into a common prison; and if the people look on and endure this with stupid tranquillity, they are ready for any tyranny, and any tyrant may be sure of success. They have committed this outrage upon Mr. Hyatt at the instigation of the slave party and power, and it is an outrage on us all. And yet, we are counselled to keep quiet, because, if the free party talk too loud, it will hazard their interests! Political expediency makes men speak even of such an outrage with bated breath, lest the agitation against it may damage the prospects of some who have sanctioned it, even in the very party proclaiming to be the guardians of liberty!

Let there be a mass meeting gathered in this city to express the judgment and feeling of the people against this monstrous outrage; and if a deputation of a hundred freemen should be appointed to go to Washington, to present themselves before the Senate, with a demand for the release of a citizen imprisoned without law, without crime, without trial, it would be no more than is due to our own freedom and dignity, and to the Hampden who, for conscience and for our sakes, is the victim of this despotism.

Dr. Cheever's speech was frequently interrupted by hearty and prolonged cheering.

SPEECH OF WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—Among the tracts recently published by the American Anti-Slavery Society is one entitled, 'The New Reign of Terror in the Slave States, for the Years 1860-61.' It makes a pamphlet of 144 pages, and is occupied with a recital of the multitudinous atrocities perpetrated within that short period upon Northern citizens found in the Southern States, and suspected, merely because they were Northern citizens, of sympathizing with those in bondage. Tamed and feathered, their heads shaved, their bodies scourged with the whip, and every atrocity and indignity possible committed upon them—and this, so far as the North is concerned, without any general indignation or alarm, without any thought of possible redress, almost with entire indifference and apathy, as though every man felt himself made simply to be used up by the slaveholder or his minion, if found south of Mason and Dixon's line! Hundreds of cases are here brought together, and hundreds more might be added; and yet men talk to us about our country, our Union, our Constitution, our flag—men who know, if they know anything, if they are not idiots, that, so far as the southern portion of our country is concerned, no man is allowed to stand upon its soil, and be a free man before God. The slaveholder may talk of the whole country for himself; the slaveholder may glory in the Constitution; the slaveholder may boast of the star-spangled banner protecting him everywhere. So it does. He may come, and does come, to the North, and he marches over our soil as though he were a demigod—the tallest man among us—the man of the freest speech—the man who dares to say just whatever he chooses, and to spit in our faces and insult us in regard to our ideas of freedom, and to scorn our free institutions, and he does so with all possible impunity; nobody thinks of molesting him; let him speak, let him curse, let him do what he pleases. On the other hand, any man going down from the North to the South, if he dare to whisper but one single word that indicates hatred of slavery, he is in deadly peril. There is no Constitution to protect him; no Union for him; no star-spangled banner to wave over his head. And yet men talk about preserving 'the glorious Union!' What infatuation is this!

However, I did not intend to make any remarks at this time, but only to introduce to you one of the victims—Mr. JAMES CRANGALE, of Ireland, who has been a resident of our country some two years, and of whose atrocious treatment in Georgia you may have heard. He is here, and I invite him to the platform to tell his own story.

Mr. CRANGALE, who was received with hearty applause, then proceeded to detail the circumstances connected with the outrage perpetrated upon him in Augusta, Ga., with which the readers of the *Liberator* are already familiar, and which are given in the pamphlet entitled, 'The New Reign of Terror,' to which Mr. Garrison referred. In conclusion, Mr. C. said that he endorsed the doctrine which had been advocated from that platform, and that hereafter he should use every exertion in his power to bring about the emancipation of the slave. (Applause.)

Mr. GARRISON again came forward, and, assuming the topic on which he was speaking when he introduced Mr. Crangale, said:

This book ('The New Reign of Terror') ought to be circulated by millions throughout the Free States; a copy, at least, should be in every household, to 'stir a fever in the blood of age, and make the infant's sinews strong as steel.' What would be the feeling of the South, provided a hundredth part of the outrages committed upon Northern citizens had been perpetrated upon Southern men at the North? How many slaveholders could we catch and lynch, make them pay for their own imprisonment, shave their heads, lacerate their bodies, tar and feather them, all because they were Southern men, before there would be a lightning flame throughout the entire South, and the whole body of slaveholders would spring up as one man, and declare war to the knife, if security could not be obtained in any other way? But, on our side, there is no strong emotion, no popular indignation, no sense of the value of liberty. We read these outrages in the papers from day to day as mere items of intelligence. It would seem as if every spark of manhood had died out from our souls; and yet some sparks are still left. I am sorry Mr. Crangale was subjected to such outrageous treatment at the South; and I am glad they caught an Irishman; (laughter) and though I wish well to every Irishman in the world, I should not object to their catching some more of them. (Renewed laughter.) 'A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind,' you know; and it is well, perhaps, that we should taste of this cup together. There is another case of an Irishman in Carolina, who was suspected of being an Abolitionist, and was stripped and flogged. They tarred and feathered him, and they tarred him more than once—they used cotton-tar and cotton! Two or three of these cases happening to Irishmen, it woke up the indignation of the Catholic party in this city, (*The Tablet*), and the editor declared that if it had come to this, that freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and safety of locomotion had ceased in the South, the sooner the Union was dashed in pieces, the better. (Loud applause.) Therefore I felt gratified that, at last, the Irish heart had been touched, and the Irish spirit aroused, through personal sufferings at the hands of Southern ruffians.

We have had a great deal to contend with, so far as the Irish population of our country are concerned. I have often said that if there was a fair stand-up fight between native-born Americans, we should soon settle the question. But the calamity has been that the millions who have come here from the Old World in quest of homes, have been used by the Slave Power of the country to perpetrate the chains of those in bondage. I do not feel indignant in regard to their position, but only deeply compassionate. 'They know not what they do.' But it is a tremendous political and religious power exerted in one direction, and that is against the Anti-Slavery enterprise. A few years ago, O'Connell, Father Mathew, and seventy thousand other Irishmen, a considerable portion of them priests of the Catholic Church in Ireland, put their names to an Anti-Slavery Address, calling upon Irishmen in this country to be true to the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and to regard the Abolitionists as the only true friends of freedom in America. But it was received with indifference, contempt, nay, even with hostility, by the great body of Irishmen here. I am very glad, therefore, if it must be so, that through their own sufferings they are made to understand and feel what slavery is.

Let me give you an extract from the speech of O'Connell on the subject of American slavery—and I would that every Irishman in our country could read the words of the great Liberator, as a voice from the other world, and give a hearty and cordial assent to them. Mr. O'Connell had been admonished by the Irish Repeal Associations in our country, that if he opened his lips in opposition to American slavery, no money would be sent over to the Irish National Repeal Association. But he stood up grandly and defiantly, and said:

'Yes, I will say, shame on every man in America who is not an anti-slavery man; shame and disgrace upon him! I don't care for the consequences. I will not restrain my honest indignation of feeling, nor pronounce every man a faithless miscreant who does not take a part for the abolition of slavery. It may be said that offence will be taken at these words. Come what may from them, they are my words. The question never came regularly before us until now. We had it introduced collaterally; we had it mentioned by persons who were friends of ours, and who were endeavoring to maintain good relations between us and the slaveholders, but it is only now that it comes directly before us. We might have shrunk from the question by referring the document to a committee; but, I would consider such a course unworthy of me, enjoying as I do the confidence of the virtuous, the religious and the humane people of Ireland; for I would be unfit to be what I desire to consider myself, the representative of the virtues of the people, if I were not ready to make every sacrifice for them, rather than to give the least sanction to human slavery.'

They say that the slaves are worse treated since the cry of the Abolitionists has been raised in their favor, as it has made their masters more suspicious of them, and more severe against them; but has any weight with you? How often was I told, during our agitation, that 'the Catholics would be emancipated, but for the violence of that O'Connell!' Why, one of the cleverest men in this country wrote a pamphlet in 1857, in which he stated that the Protestants of Ireland would have emancipated their Catholic countrymen long before, but for me, and fellows of my kind; and yet, two years after, I got emancipation in spite of them! But it is, clearly, an error in the understanding to speak so. When did tyranny relax its gripe merely because it ought to do so? As long as there was no agitation, the masters enjoyed the possession of their slaves in quietness; but the moment the agitation commenced, they cried out, 'Oh, it is not the slave we are flogging, but we are flogging, through his back, the anti-slavery men.' But the slavery is too serious for ridicule. I am afraid they will never give up their slaves, or their horrible calamity befall their country; and I here warn them against the event, for it is utterly impossible that slavery can continue much longer. But, good Heaven! can Irishmen be found to justify, or rather to palliate, (for no one could dare attack it to justify,) a system which shuts out the book of human knowledge, and seeks to reduce to the condition of a slave millions of human beings—which closes against them not only the light of human science, but the rays of divine revelation, and the doctrine which is the word of God came upon the earth to plant! The man who would do so belongs not to my kind. Over the broad Atlantic I pour forth my voice, saying, 'Come out of such a land, you Irishmen; or, if you remain, and dare countenance the system of slavery that is supported there, we will recognize you as Irishmen no longer.'

I want to say a word of what is called infidelity. Reference has been made to it several times on this platform during our meetings, and the first question that I would ask is, What have we to do with it, as a matter of criticism, of condemnation or approval, here? What right has any man to come to this platform, and point the finger at another, on the ground that he is an infidel, as though he were a depraved and dangerous man? Yet, so common is it, on the part of those who fancy that wisdom will die with them, and that they are really the representatives of Papal infidelity, though Protestants by name, that it comes as a matter of course for them to deal in this kind of speech. Now, we are here for one specific object. Suppose the city were on fire, and every person interested in saving it from destruction should be seen rushing to it with all his might, to put out the conflagration—I ask you, would that be a time to talk about theological differences of opinion, or to attempt to define who was orthodox or heterodox? No; such conduct would be an outrage. I think that, if, in the midst of the conflagration, any man should step forward and say, 'I protest against working with that man at the engine, or pouring the buckets with him, because he is an infidel! I am as much opposed to this conflagration as anybody; I am as much in favor of putting it out as any one, but I cannot work with an infidel,' the people would say at once, 'That is the villain who set the city on fire.' (Laughter and applause.) It would be an act so absurd, so impertinent, so monstrous, that, unless the man could be considered insane, the solid judgment of the city would be that he set it on fire, or knew who did it, and wanted the city to be burnt down. What matters it whether a man who comes upon this platform is a Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, Universalist, or so-called infidel? We do not come here to settle theological opinions, to subscribe to creeds, or to point the finger individually at one another. We must not do it. We are here to recognize the slave in his chains as a man, and his right to immediate freedom as at the hands of God; and if we agree upon this, let us leave the things about which we differ to take care of themselves elsewhere. (Applause.)

I hold that this term 'infidel' is a mad-dog cry, raised for an evil purpose, and that, on Protestant ground, no man has a right to use the term 'infidel' towards any other man, for differing in opinion from him, even though that difference be heaven-wide. What is Protestantism? Is it a Pope and Cardinals? No. Is it Councils to override individual conscience? No. It is the right of every man to do his own thinking, and to come to his own conclusions as to the will of God or what is right, and to obey his own conscience, though he stand alone in the universe. That is Protestantism. Now, then, on the ground of Protestantism, whoever is true to his own convictions cannot be an infidel, no matter what those convictions may be. (Applause.) He may be in error, but he is not an infidel. The man who says, 'This is my conscientious belief,' and acts up to that belief, is a consistent man, and, showing in that act an earnest desire to be true to his duty, deserves respect. Among Protestants, infidelity is possible only in two ways. First, a man may be infidel to his own convictions; and if he is, brand him as such. Then, again, he may be infidel to his own pledges. He may promise to do what he ought to do, and break his promise; that is infidelity. Now, this nation is an infidel nation. Why? Because it declares that it holds these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty; and then enslave every seventh person in the land. Any man, any body of men, untrue to their own standard, are guilty of infidelity.

Whoever is true to his convictions cannot, as a Protestant, possibly be an infidel. It is the old cry, 'Have you ever thought of it? All the good men of this world, who have been put to death on the ground of their heresies, heretics, blasphemers, and therefore deserving to be put to death. It will ever stand recorded upon the page of history, that Jesus was crucified by those who claimed to be the very elect of God, and who have heard his blasphemous words, and yet further witnesses!' And from the beginning of the glorious movement, one of the most effective means has been the raising of this cry of 'infidelity' against those engaged heartily in this great work. Wherever there was ever a cause that has shown itself to be a religion, that has gone down to the roots of things, that has been characterized by a lofty morality and a true religious spirit, it is the anti-slavery movement. It has had no arm of flesh to lean upon, only the living God. It has never relied upon the arm of man, but upon that truth which is mighty, and able to subvert to overcome all opposition. Still, we are here theologically to settle anything. It is of no consequence what a man professes. What do I care that any man calls himself by the name of Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Unitarian, or Universalist? I do not know him by the name. These are idle terms; empty as the whistling wind; easily accepted, easily worn. No, before I will give my judgment of him, I must put my finger upon his pulse; I must know the man; I must get his ideas of justice and humanity; I must know whether he dares to be a man; and it will be upon that ground that I will give him my regard, and not because he is a Presbyterian, Methodist, or Liberalist. (Applause.)

What is a profession of faith in Christ worth in this country? Worth nothing. What does it prove in this country? Nothing, except that a man is in the fashion; except that he says what everybody says. What does it prove among Mohammedans that a man says, 'There is one God, and Mahomet is his prophet'? Nothing! nothing of character, nothing as to the moral condition of the man. And here, in this country, to profess faith in the Christ of America, a Christ that sanctions slave-breeding, slave-holding, and slavery-extension, why, it is to go with the fashion, and to be on the popular side. It is of no value. It is salt that has lost its savor. I do not care that a man tells me he believes in Christ—I do not care that he believes in that term. Let him show me that he believes in one who, like Christ, stands in his day despised and rejected of men; that has sympathies with the lowest and most persecuted of God's creatures, and is willing to suffer the loss of all things, if need be, that he may be redeemed, and then I will give him my heart. The absurdity is in trying to perpetuate the old terms, the old tests; in supposing that there have been no new sins, new evidences of hostility to righteousness, demanding other tests than the old ones. They said to Jesus, those proud, pretensions, dissembling Pharisees, 'Are you yet? We have Abraham for our father.' Did it cost them anything at that time to say that? No; it was to be in the fashion. But, in the days of Abraham, to have been an Abrahamite meant something. Here we are in the midst of Protestantism. It is easy to say we are Protestants; it is not the slightest evidence of character; but when Luther nailed his theses to the church door, and had to meet the malignant opposition of all the Catholic powers in Europe, banded to crush him and the Reformation he inaugurated, a man, and how much he dared to say for conscience and in the cause of God. (Applause.) What did care that an American now shouts, 'Hurrah to Bunker Hill! I glory in George Washington!' Indeed! Indeed! Is not that marvellous courage? I have the highest respect for the memory of Sam Adams and John Hancock. No doubt of it; it is the fashion. Cowards and demagogues, Democratic office-holders and office-seekers, are saying these things all the time, and prove their emptiness by saying them. The true man does not go back to Luther. Luther had his work to do in his day; Jesus his work in his day; the prophets their work in their day; and they did not turn back to glorify Moses or Abraham, but they said to the people, 'Your hands are full of blood; wash you, you men; you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes.' 'Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites! When the revolutionary war was launched, when the tide of battle was sweeping onward, when our fathers stood up against the colossal power of the mother country, at the imminent peril of their lives, then it was heroic, and showed what manner of men they were; but for us now to have our Fourth of July celebrations, as they are now observed, and declare that British oppression, and boast about what our fathers did, it is all stuff! We ought to be in business. We ought not to keep any day, any day of humiliation, fasting and prayer, but liberty is proclaimed throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof.' (Loud applause.)

The other day, I received a copy of the *Liberator* with the work of Dr. Cheever, vindicating the Bible as an anti-slavery volume; and I think he has done it most conclusively. I said so in my paper, and I am most warmly commending the work to the attention and consideration of those who have an idea that the Divine sanction of slavery in the Bible, has received the divine sanction of the Bible. (Voice: 'Shame!') Yes, the sacredness of the Bible, when I say that the rights of man are not dependent upon any parchment! Why, I was merely reiterating the Declaration of Independence: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident—not pertaining to Greek particles or Hebrew roots, or to past ages, not needing any logic, originating in any volume—SELF-EVIDENT that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty.' And that is an infidelity—that is to scorn the Bible! Well, it will be charitable to believe that the man who wrote that article in the *Independent* is an idiot; otherwise, it is evidence of Satanic malignity. How do I prove it? I tempt upon any book when I say that the rights of man grow out of man's nature? What or where is the dishonor when I say that? God, or man, or the Bible? No! I had said that Dr. Cheever had greatly demonstrated the Bible to be an anti-slavery book; and that it is such I have asserted for thirty years. I have asserted that the Bible is the only authority against the four interpretations of the pro-slavery clergy of this country, who maintaining that the Bible, as 'the word of God,' sanctions slavery, thereby, as 'the word of God,' maintains that this Bible fore slavery is right; and I maintaining that this Bible is a thunderbolt to hurl slavery to the dust. (Loud applause.) I hold it to be a perfect truth that God's truth on that subject; that if there be any God in this world, more than another, to God, it is the sin of oppressing the poor and the needy; that if any one thing in it is commanded, more than another, it is to 'preclaim liberty throughout all the land; to do to the heavy burdens, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free.' (Applause.) Nevertheless, when the book goes for freedom or not, man was made for freedom; whether the book is really on the side of human rights or not, human rights are never to be sacrificed. Man is man, and can never be justly enslaved; and if the book be made out as against God, it is simply proof that the book is not from God, but came from beneath, and ought to be sent down. (Applause.) I hold it to be every where refuted, right upon the subject, but not originating man's rights.

its An-
 Tremont
 A. M.
 D. Dr.
 o'oro' Jail,
 e Proshy-
 and Spirit
 H. W.
 Rev. A.
 C. Rev.
 all the
 requested
 on Hall of
 EVER.
 US of the
 US will
 and hereafter
 URGH-
 at Har-
 and Spirit
 ery Thar-
 S-SLAVE
 better to
 on Build-
 ists Frank-
 position is
 and are mo-
 BOSTON
 D. Dr.
 BOSTON
 arch.
 ety.
 ELOPES
 Work.
 TROUD
 LAWY-
 S.'
 this book
 every fam-
 omeo's tim-
 e effective
 large dis-
 CO.,
 SILENS,
 BOSTON
 ent.
 STREET,
 N. L.
 Winter fo-
 The Doo-
 aration of
 antry. T-
 his Hous-
 ion is ver-
 from the
 , excel-
 otels.
 I. D.,
 oprietor.
 N G
 & CO
 IN
 G,
 ET,
 from Eng-
 qualities
 best qual-
 ists, and
 erminant
 and qual-
 anton as
 TING.
 ES,
 GE,
 ellers
 ST.,
 MASS.
 dders
 SON.
 5 pages,
 An New
 An New
 eching R-
 and Duty
 from the
 field. Str-
 North
 E.
 ER
 man's, 2
 man's P
 MRS RY-
 of the
 woodward
 makers;
 LER, w
 of the
 of Har-
 Character
 are ins-

